

REMARKS

With this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 8, and 9 and cancel claim 2.
Therefore, claims 1 and 3-9 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

Claim Amendments

With this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 8, and 9 to include the limitations of cancelled claim 2.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Arquilevich (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0060709). Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Endo (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0085057). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Yuji (JP 05-330088). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests ejecting ink form at least one nozzle of the two nozzle arrays most distanced from each other in the main scanning direction and shifting and correcting the position of an ink dot to be recorded based on an amount of position deviation of an ink dot ejected and recorded from the at least one nozzle, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 8, and 9.

Thanks to this feature, the accuracy of the correction is improved. According to the example illustrated in Figure 3A, as the accuracy is proportional to the distance between nozzle arrays, when the nozzle arrays most distanced from each other are used, the recording position is

corrected nine times more accurately than when adjacent nozzle arrays are used. The cited references fail to teach or suggest such steps and configuration.

Additionally, Applicants note that Endo merely discloses a method for testing whether inoperative nozzles exist or not, but fails to teach or suggest correcting a recording position.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 9 are patentable over the cited references and that claims 3-7 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1 and 3-9 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470